

Decisions of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Planning Committee

21 January 2016

Members Present:-

Councillor Eva Greenspan (Chairman)
Councillor John Marshall (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Jack Cohen
Councillor Arjun Mittra

Councillor Alan Schneiderman
Councillor Jim Tierney

Apologies for Absence:-

Councillor Melvin Cohen

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

RESOLVED – The minutes of the meeting held on the 9th of December 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS (IF ANY)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Melvin Cohen.

3. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND NON PECUNIARY INTERESTS (IF ANY)

The following interest was declared:

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest	Details
Alan Schneiderman	7	Non-pecuniary.	That the councillor used to live in a neighbouring property. The councillor indicated that he would not be taking part in the debate of this item, and would leave the meeting during consideration of the item.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS (IF ANY)

None.

6. MEMBERS' ITEMS (IF ANY)

None.

7. BLOCKS 7 AND 8, CHANDOS WAY LONDON NW11 7HF - 15/03207/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer’s report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Mr Sam Roberts and Mr Nick Jenkins, who spoke in objection to the application, and from Mr Nigel Young who spoke as the applicant’s representative.

Councillor Rohit Grover spoke in objection to the application in his capacity as ward councillor.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	0
Against	6
Abstain	0

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to REFUSE the application (being a reversal of the officer’s recommendations).**

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposed development by virtue of the size and siting would result in an incongruous form of development that would erode the uniformity of the buildings and the estate as a whole to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the streetscene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012).
2. The proposed development by virtue of its siting over existing rooflights serving the top floor flats would lead to significant reduction of natural light being received to these flats and result in a substandard quality of accommodation giving rise to an unacceptable loss of existing residential amenities. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012).
3. The proposed development would result in the loss of existing visitor parking spaces. As such the proposal is likely to result in an unacceptable increase in parking pressure in the area detrimental to the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety contrary to policies CS9 of the Adopted Local Plan Core Strategy and Policy DM17 of the Adopted Development Management Policies 2012.

8. BLOCKS 4 AND 5 BRITTEN CLOSE LONDON NW11 7HW - 15/03208/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer’s report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Mr Michael Sternberg and Mr Rod Riley, who spoke in objection to the application, and from Mr Nigel Young who spoke as the applicant's representative.

Councillor Rohit Grover spoke in objection to the application in his capacity as ward councillor.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	0
Against	6
Abstain	0

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to REFUSE the application (being a reversal of the officer's recommendations).**

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposed development by virtue of the size and siting would result in an incongruous form of development that would erode the uniformity of the buildings and the estate as a whole to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the streetscene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012).
2. The proposed development by virtue of its siting over existing rooflights serving the top floor flats would lead to significant reduction of natural light being received to these flats and result in a substandard quality of accommodation giving rise to an unacceptable loss of existing residential amenities. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012).
3. The proposed development would result in the loss of existing visitor parking spaces. As such, the proposal is likely to result in an unacceptable increase in parking pressure in the area detrimental to the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety contrary to policies CS9 of the Adopted Local Plan Core Strategy and Policy DM17 of the Adopted Development Management Policies 2012.

9. 11 MIDDLETON ROAD LONDON NW11 7NR - 15/06090/HSE

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

An oral representation was heard from Ms Laura Cullen, who spoke in objection to the application.

Following discussion of the item, the committee unanimously deferred the item to a future meeting of the committee on the grounds that there were a number of mistakes in

the report that needed to be corrected before full consideration could be given to the application.

10. 1069 FINCHLEY ROAD LONDON NW11 0PU - 15/07709/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer's report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Mr Ron Bananjee, who spoke in objection to the application, and from Mr Eli Pick who spoke as the applicant's representative.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	6
Against	0
Abstain	0

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to APPROVE the application as per the officer's recommendations and subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report, with an additional condition and amendment as follows:**

1. ADDITIONAL CONDITION: No pedestrians; vehicles or waste vehicles shall access the proposed development via Temple Gardens at any one time.
 - Reason: To safeguard the amenities of existing neighbouring residents.
2. AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 32 TO READ:
 - The existing high wall to the rear of the police station and immediately to the rear of properties 10-16 Temple Gardens shall be retained at all times and under no circumstances be demolished as part of the proposed development.

11. 35 WINDSOR ROAD LONDON N3 3SN - 15/06273/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer's report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Mr Dennis Pepper, who spoke in objection to the application, and from the applicant.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	1
Against	4
Abstain	1

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to REFUSE the application (being a reversal of the officer's recommendations).**

Immediately following the decision, the Chairman **referred the decision to the Planning Committee.**

12. 44 COTSWOLD GARDENS LONDON NW2 1QU - 15/04606/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer's report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Ms Luisa Vallejo, who spoke in objection to the application, and from the applicant.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	2
Against	2
Abstain	2

The Chairman used her casting vote to approve the application.

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to APPROVE the application as per the officer's recommendations and subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.**

13. 163 CHEVIOT GARDENS LONDON NW2 1PY - 15/05128/HSE

Councillor Alan Schneiderman left the meeting for the debate of this item due to the interest that he declared.

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer's report and the published addendum.

Oral representations were heard from Ms Savita Bailur and Ms Louise Gilbert, who spoke in objection to the application, and from the applicant.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	2
Against	2
Abstain	1

The Chairman used her casting vote to approve the application.

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to APPROVE the application as per the officer's recommendations and subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.**

14. 26 RAVENSDALE AVENUE LONDON N12 9HT - 15/06818/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application. The committee noted the information set out in the officer's report.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations. Votes were recorded as follow:

For	2
Against	3
Abstain	1

The committee therefore **RESOLVED to REFUSE the application (being a reversal of the officer's recommendations).**

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

The proposed development by virtue of its size, siting, scale, bulk and design would represent an overdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the street scene. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012).

15. ANY ITEM(S) THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

None.

The meeting finished at 9.12 pm